DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 596 AL 002 783

AUTHOR Surlin, Stuart H.
TITLE Projective Responses to Racially Identifiable Speech by Racially Prejudiced and Non-Prejudiced Individuals.
PUB DATE Apr 71
NOTE 35p.; Paper prepared for the International Communication Association Conference, Phoenix, Arizona, April 22-24, 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Auditory Discrimination, *Bias, *Negro Dialects, Negro Stereotypes, *Projective Tests, *Racial Discrimination

ABSTRACT

This projective exploratory study in responses by racially prejudiced and non-prejudiced individuals to samples of black speech, which was designed as a means of uncovering trends, resulted in some conclusions "made with some degree of assurance": (1) The Southern students participating in the study were significantly more prejudiced than the Northern students; (2) Subjects tended to respond to black identifiable voices in the same negative manner as is customarily found in personal contact or discussion of blacks; (3) Subjects holding relatively similar racial attitudes relative to the norms of their social environment reacted in a relatively similar manner to the same racial stimulus; (4) Bogardus Social Distance ratings tended to directly relate to the projective responses of each group, e.g., the less negative the prejudice ratings, the less negative the projective responses tended to be, and vice versa; (5) More research should be done in this area in order to strengthen these tentative conclusions. (AMM)

ED 048596

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROJECTIVE RESPONSES TO RACIALLY IDENTIFIABLE SPEECH BY RACIALLY PREJUDICED AND NON-PREJUDICED INDIVIDUALS

by

Stuart H. Surlin

School of Journalism

University of Georgia

Athens, Georgia 30601

International Communication Association

Phoenix, Arizona

April 22 - 24, 1971

AL 002 783

"PROJECTIVE RESPONSES TO RACIALLY IDENTIFIABLE SPEECH
BY RACIALLY PREJUDICED AND NON-PREJUDICED INDIVIDUALS" *

Division: Mass Communication

Sociolinguists study the relationship between language and society. The social organization of a society (i.e., social rank and class) has been found to reveal itself through the linguistic distinctions found within the society. The dialect of an individual is used as a basis for subjective judgements concerning the social position and overall personality of the individual (2, 9, 10, 13, 14).

Within any advanced society linguistic distinctions will be found. Distinctions can be made between social and territorial dialects. They are both considered "partial" languages. Territorial dialects - dialects in the common use of the term - are used within a fixed stretch of territory, social dialects may be spread over the entire territory of the language, and more than one may be found in a specific territory. Territorial dialects may serve the masses of a nation, social dialects serve one group within a nation, they are not territorially limited.[1]

The identification of a distinctive dialect is associated with the social group most closely identified with that dialect. This group may be characterized by their territory (10) for lack of a better means of characterizing the group, or they may be characterized by their nationality (8, 9), by their cultural group (2), or by their race (13, 14).

*The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance he received from Mr. Frazier Moore, Jr., a University of Georgia Advertising major, who was of help in the collection and analysis of the data.

Irrespective of the manner in which the dialect is characterized, the receiver's attitude toward the source will be affected by the dialect perceived. One's attitude will include the stereotyped characteristics of the group to which the communicator is perceived as belonging (9).

Recent studies concerning social dialects have determined the existence of a structurally different Negro dialect, with unique features of pronunciation, grammar, and lexicon.[2] An anthropologist has recently gone as far as saying that black English is a separate language from standard English and is not only a dialect. He feels that black English is very much alike in all parts of the United States and that research may show it to be more uniform throughout the nation than standard English.[3]

Whether an individual language or merely a dialect, black English arouses within an individual attitudinal responses related to the stereotypes attached to blacks in our society (14). An interaction between the perceived dialect and the receiver of the message has recently been discovered. Mowlana and Holz (13), in their study involving black and white sources communicating with either segregated or integrated black and white school children, found that the perception of the black and white communicator was found to vary as both a function of the voice quality of the communicator as well as the situational and racial characteristics of the listening audience.[4]

Situational and racial characteristics are ways of classifying the listening audience. These variables are directly equated with attitude formation. It was assumed by Mowlana and Holz that segregated whites would rate the white voice most positively while rating the black voice

most negatively, and the opposite for segregated blacks. This is based on the assumption that a segregated existence leads to a negative overall attitude toward the other race, and, thus to negative reactions to a voice identified with a member of this race. Why make this inferential leap?

This study deals with the response of high, middle, and low prejudiced whites to a recognizable black dialect. The author believes "prejudice" to be the predictor variable for one's response pattern. A segregated or an integrated racial environment may or may not be an antecedent for prejudiced social attitudes.

METHOD

The subjects for this study (N = 69) are divided into two regional groups - Northern and Southern. The Northern group (n = 37) consists of students enrolled in the "Introduction to Communication" course at Michigan State University (gathered while the author was enrolled in the Mass Communication doctoral program at Michigan State University). The Southern group (n = 32) consists of students enrolled in the "Introduction to Advertising" and "Introduction to Public Relations" courses at the University of Georgia.

Prejudice ratings were gathered through the use of the revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale (see Appendix). This scale is used to measure the social distance or degree of social acceptance that exists between given persons and certain social groups. The Social Distance Scale has been found to carry high degrees of reliability and validity (12). It has also been found to be highly correlated with ratings gathered through the use of the California F Scale (9).

The voices used as stimuli for this study consisted of a cut from an album recorded by Champion Jack Dupree.[5] The style and rhythm of the song is similar to "Negro talking blues." The rhythm is slow. The only instrumentation consists of a piano. The 'slow shuffling' beat continues throughout the recording. The men in the recording speak in a dialect easily identified as "Uneducated Negro." The text of the song is included in the Appendix.

Responses were gathered through the use of a projective sentence-completion questionnaire. (See Appendix) Past studies have used semantic-differential type scales (2, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14). However, it was felt that an indirect approach to gathering information would prove fruitful in delineating the total attitude formation held by prejudiced and non-prejudiced individuals. Projection can be thought of as "noncommunicative behavior." The projective technique is used as a method of interpreting noncommunicative behavior, or of determining the attitudes people will not or cannot express.

Thus, by presenting to the respondent a relatively ambiguous stimuli - in this case, an incomplete sentence - and asking the respondent to organize and interpret the stimuli he will in the process reveal a good deal about his own conflicts, adjustive techniques, and other aspects of his mental state. Projective techniques emphasize the inner attitudes and general ego structure of the subject to a greater extent than do more "structured" nonprojective tests.

There are two drawbacks to the usage of projective techniques in communication research. They are: (1) difficulty in interpreting responses,

and (2) difficulty in quantifying responses. It is felt, however, that both potential problem areas have been successfully overcome.

The sentence completion technique used in this study uniquely departs from its normal usage. In most cases the incomplete sentence can be completed on the basis of one's generalized experiences. They are answerable regardless of the specific experiences the respondents have had. For example, they may be "I wish....", "I hate....", or "I plan...." (6). The incomplete sentences contained in this study relate to a common experience for all respondents. Because of the commonality of experience, the differentiating variable should be the antecedent degree of prejudice held by each individual toward the source of the sentence.

Each subject participated in the experiment in the same manner. The Social Distance Scale was distributed to each class within the first two weeks of the quarter. Several weeks later an audio tape of the song was played to the class. The song was in no way connected, either through word or action, with their ratings on the Social Distance Scale. Before the song was played, the class was instructed to "listen carefully to this song which I will now play for you." After the song was played, the subjects were asked to "read the instructions at the top of the questionnaire and fill in the missing word or words with what you believe the man in the tape would most likely say."

After the questionnaires were filled in and collected, the class was asked, "How many of you thought that the men in the song were black?" By a show of hands, it was ascertained that every student in each class had perceived the men "talking" in the song to be black. This racial

identification was based entirely upon the vocal cues characteristic of the black dialect used by the men in the recording.

Northern subjects responded to a question posed within a later assignment which referred back to their experience with the experiment. Various sentences and phrases used by the students to refer to the experience clearly validate the experimental technique. Also, some of the student's statements present an insight to their cognitive processes and to their racial identifications. (See Appendix)

FINDINGS

The seven-step Bogardus scale was interpreted as containing equal appearing intervals.[6]

Social distance ratings for the Northern and Southern subjects were found to be significantly different. The Southern group was found to be significantly more prejudice ($t = 1.89$, $df = 58$, $.02 < p > .05$, one-tail).

The subjects were then categorized into general groupings so that cell sizes would be large enough for further analysis. Due to the time difference between the distribution of the Bogardus Scale and the projective questionnaire there are sample size differences in the results. There were thirty-seven Northern students and thirty-two Southern students who filled in the projective questionnaire. Of these students, twenty-seven and twenty-one, respectively, had also filled out the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. Thus, twenty-one students filled in the projective questionnaire without having prejudice ratings to compare them against. (See Table #1)

The subjects were categorized according to the last row they had checked on the Bogardus scale. The least-prejudiced checked all the rows. The middle-prejudiced checked all but the top row, and the most-prejudiced left more than just the top row blank. This level of categorization dilutes the extreme responses received from the Southern group. Thus, the chi-square test of significance for the Northern and Southern groups, using the three levels of prejudice, is non-significant at the .05 level ($x^2 = 5.49$, df = 2). A $x^2 = 5.99$ was needed for significance at the .05 level.

Response trends to "What time is it, man?" were difficult to find. The students generally perceived the event to be occurring sometime in the evening, approximately 6 p.m. to 11 p.m. The Southern students mentioned "dusk" quite often. This could also probably be considered early evening. (See Table #2)

"You got the _____" responses were more easily categorized. The responses were categorized according to positive or negative "feeling" responses (ex., "positive" - beat, faith, word; "negative" - shakes, blues, jumps); or, positive or negative "physical" responses (ex., "positive" - strength; "negative" - gout, sore feet, slowest walk). (See Table #3) There are Northern-Southern as well as prejudice level differences for these responses.

The Northern subjects mentioned "negative feeling" responses more often than "positive feeling" responses, 32% to 27%; while the Southern subjects were, to a greater degree, more apt to mention "negative feeling" responses, 56% ,to "positive feeling" responses, 19%.

Interestingly, the Northern subjects were definitely more inclined to mention "negative physical" responses, 19%, relative to their mention of "positive physical" responses, 3%, and especially more inclined relative to the Southern responses, 3% and zero percentage, respectively. Thus, the Northerner attributes more negative "physical" behavior to the black man. This is an understandable reaction to recent violence by blacks in the North.

When broken down on the basis of prejudice levels, it is clear that the middle-prejudiced Northerner and the high-prejudiced Southerner make up the largest groups of the "negative feeling" category, 58% and 33%, respectively.

In response to "Man, did you see _____?", the tendency to mention a "female" and "the police" were evident; however, many other objects were named (ex., - that truck, accident, that, that man, his face). (See Table #4) Very little regional or prejudice level differences were noted.

Regional and prejudice levels differences were noted in the responses to "One thing I would like to do is _____." First, the responses by Northerners were to a large degree more centered around "Liquor", 27%, than were responses by Southerners, 3%. While on the other hand, Southerners were more apt to respond with the statements "run away," "die," "leave," etc., 47% to 27% for the Northerners. Thus, there is a tendency for Northerners to believe that black people want to "drink" themselves out of their plight while Southerners tend to feel that blacks would rather "wish" themselves out of their plight, or "run away" from the situation.

Second, prejudice level differences are noted. To the response "run away/regress or repress", the middle-prejudiced Northerner and the high-prejudiced Southerner tend to be the largest contributors, 80% and 33% respectively. (See Table #5)

In response to the statement "But, I want _____," regional and prejudice levels can also be noted. Northerners still respond with "drink" to a greater degree than Southerners, 27% to 6%; both groups respond less with "run away/regress or repress", 19% and 16% for Southern and Northern groups respectively; and both groups added a new response category, "desire for improving oneself and/or others," 9% for the Southern group and 8% for the Northern group. Example responses to this new category are: "get somewhere," "money," "to get saved," etc.

Again, the middle-prejudiced Northerner and the high-prejudiced Southerner dominate the response categories "drink", 40% and 100%, and "run away/regress or repress", 67% and 33% respectively. (See Table #6)

Responses to the last sentence on the questionnaire, "I think I'll get some _____," point to regional and prejudice level differences. Again, the Northern respondents referred to "liquor" to a greater extent than did the Southern respondents, 59% to 44% respectively. Both groups mentioned "dope", 16% of the Southerners and 16% of the Northerners, as a probable response. Once more, the middle-prejudiced Northerners and the high-prejudiced Southerners were relatively similar in their responses. The middle-prejudiced Northerners used "liquor" as a frequent response to this question, 45%, while the high-prejudiced Southerners responded with "liquor" quite predominately, 28%. (See Table #7)

No significant trends are perceived when breaking down prejudice ratings by "Sex." (See Table #8) The same holds true for the analysis of prejudice ratings by "Year in School." (See Table #9) However, when prejudice ratings are categorized by "Scholastic Achievement," a regional - prejudice level trend can be detected.[7]

The most - and least-prejudiced Northerners are generally the best Northern students, while the middle-prejudiced Southerners are generally the best Southern students. The "Average" students tend to be the middle prejudiced Northerners, 50%, and the high-prejudiced Southerners, 47%. No trend developed for the Poor" students. (See Table #10)

DISCUSSION

Overall, one does detect a negative evaluation projected upon the perceived black men in the experimental stimulus by both groups of respondents. The Southern group has been found to rate itself as significantly more "distant" from blacks than did the Northern group. The projections made by the Southern group did seem to be more negative than the Northern group.

The Northern group responded with the alternative "liquor" to a significant degree greater than the Southern group. The author is at a loss to explain the reasoning behind this type of response difference. The Northern group feels that blacks tend to use liquor as a means of satisfying their "likes" or "wants." On the other hand, the Southerner was more apt to see the black man as trying to "escape" from his environment through physical or mental flight. This points to an interesting divergence in the regional stereotype of the black man.

Another pattern was developed by regional prejudice-level breakdowns. Consistently, the middle-prejudiced Northerner responded in the same relative manner as did the high-prejudiced Southerner. This response pattern can be explained as a manifestation of "functional prejudice." In the North the normative (i.e., expected) response by white to blacks is epitomized by the low-prejudiced individual. The high-prejudiced Northerner is extremely deviant but remains staunchly prejudiced because this accomplishes his goal--to be deviant. The middle-prejudiced Northerner feels a great deal of social pressure. He is not extremely deviant, and has no desire to be so. But, then again, he is not "normal," and this is difficult to accept on his part.

Similar reasoning can be extended to the Southern group. Because of the higher degree of prejudice evident in the region, the middle-prejudiced person could be considered the norm. The low-prejudiced individual is the extreme deviant--which suits his needs. The highly-prejudiced Southerner is the one who is feeling the social pressure to become more normative in his attitude towards blacks. This is difficult for him to accept.

Thus, the large degree of "escapive" responses by the middle-prejudiced Northerner and the high-prejudiced Southerner are understandable. They were once both part of the normative group, but now attitude changes have left them slightly deviant. They cannot accept this label. Since this label is directly related to their attitudes concerning the black man, they project their inability to accept their attitude and unconsciously say, "Please go away so I will not have to deal with the problem."

The "Scholastic Achievement" scores also seemed to point out the "desire for normality" by the middle-prejudiced Northerners and the high-prejudiced Southerners. They tended not to deviate from the "Average." They are the C students, not trying to be different. This again points out their susceptibility to being "pressured" into conforming with the norm.

Martin and Westie (11) discuss the same phenomenon in their article. They conclude:

> "... prejudice towards outgroups is part of the normative order of American society. Moreover, the degree to which rejection of particular outgroups is approved varies from one sub-culture to another and from region to region. Not only the community at large but the immediate groups to which the person belongs provide him with definitions of ingroups and the "correct" feelings and behaviors in relation to their members. Under such circumstances, we find in our midst many Happy Bigots whose prejudices are born, not so much of personal psychological difficulties, but rather of the fact that their community and various groups inculcate, expect, and approve of their prejudices; personality factors probably serve primarily to predispose and to intensify or abate normative expectations. In such situations, the tolerant person may well be the deviant and a legitimate subject for analysis in terms of abnormal psychology. He may be tolerant because tolerance is deviation, and deviation may be a functionally very important retaliatory mechanism in his personality organization. On the other hand, a person with a considerable "fund of aggression" may be tolerant towards outgroups because his ingroups inculcate and expect tolerance, and although he may be tempted to engage in scapegoating, the negative sanctions may be foreboding. Finally, a person may be tolerant because he has no unusual psychological need to be prejudiced, has been exposed to the broad normative influences in the larger society favorable to tolerance, and does not find the negative sanctions of more local forces a sufficient deterent to tolerance."[8]

Allport (1) in his discussion of "functional prejudice" states that:

> "Underlying insecurity seems to lie at the root of the personality. The individual cannot face the world unflinchingly and in a forthright manner. He seems fearful of himself,

> of his own instincts, of his own consciousness, of change, and of his social environment. ... An essential feature of this pattern is repression. Since the person cannot in his conscious life face and master the conflicts presented to him, he represses them in whole or in part. They are fragmented, forgotten, not faced. The ego simply fails to integrate the myriad of impulses that arise within the personality and the myriad of environmental pressures without. This failure engenders feelings of insecurity, and these feelings engender, in turn, repression. ... Thus an outstanding result of studies of bigoted personalities seems to be the discovery of a sharp cleavage between conscious and unconscious layers."[9]

Allport goes on to mention the possible use of projective tests as a means of probing deeper into this "conscious - unconscious" cleavage. The author feels that his use of the projective technique was successful in bridging these two levels of awareness.

One last finding warrants discussion. When the response category was changed from "I would like _____," to "But, I want _____," the responses changed. The "escapist" (i.e., "run away/regress or repress") responses were reduced from 36% to 17% and the positive "release of energy" response "live/live it up" increased from 1% to 6%. Most important, however, was the existence of a new category, which developed from the second question. The response category of "desire for improving oneself and/or others" received 9% of the mentions. The respondents projected upon the black men a desire to immediately remove themselves from the situation; but, they also included a desire or a "want" to, in the long run, improve their lot in society.

Wanting to improve oneself is interpreted as being a positive ambition in our society and is a sign of respect for individuals holding this value. Therefore, this type of response might be used as a "barometer" to measure the trend of prejudiced individuals toward a maligned group.

CONCLUSIONS

One must remain aware of the limitations of this study when drawing conclusions from its results. This projective exploratory study was designed as a means of uncovering trends - not a means of answering specific questions. However, there are some concluding statements which can be made with some degree of assurance.

First, the Southern students were found to be significantly more prejudiced than the Northern students.

Second, subjects tended to respond to black identifiable voices in the same negative manner as is customarily found in personal contact or discussion of blacks.

Third, subjects holding relatively similar racial attitudes relative to the norms of their social environment, reacted in a relatively similar manner to the same racial stimulus.

Fourth, Bogardus Social Distance ratings tended to directly relate to the projective responses of each group. In other words, the less negative the prejudice ratings, the less negative the projective responses tended to be, and vice versa. This further supports the belief that the projective technique is an effective means of tapping one's unconscious attitudes toward race.

Fifth, more research should be done in this area in order to strengthen these tentative conclusions.

TABLE #1

PREJUDICE RATING CATEGORIES

	South	North	Total
(1) Least prejudiced	5	7	12
(2) Middle prejudiced	6	14	20
(3) Most prejudiced	10	6	16
(4) No rating	11	10	21
TOTAL	32	37	69

TABLE #2

RESPONSES TO: "WHAT TIME IS IT, MAN?"

	South	North	Total
(1) 12 a.m. - 5 a.m.	2	0	2
(2) 6 a.m. -11 a.m.	0	3	3
(3) 12 p.m. - 5 p.m.	5	4	9
(4) 6 p.m. -11 p.m.	6	20	26
(5) A.M.	0	2	0
(6) P.M.	0	7	7
(7) Late	6	1	7
(8) *Other, no response, ambiguous	13	0	13
TOTAL	32	37	69

*The term "dusk" was used by the University of Georgia students only.

TABLE #3

RESPONSES TO: "YOU GOT THE _____"

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
(1) feelings/positive	4	1	5	0	3	3	0	2	2	2	4	6	6	10	16
(2) feelings/negative	5	3	8	3	1	4	4	7	11	6	1	7	18	12	30
(3) physical/positive	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
(4) physical/negative	0	3	3	1	1	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	7	8
(5) other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3	3
(6) no response	2	2	4	1	2	3	2	0	2	2	0	2	7	4	11
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE #4

RESPONSES TO: "MAN, DID YOU SEE _____?"

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
(1) woman or girl	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	4	5	1	1	2	4	7	11
(2) cop(s)/cop car	3	0	3	0	2	2	0	2	2	1	1	2	4	5	9
(3) bar/liquor store	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2
(4) other physical object	3	5	8	2	3	5	2	2	4	3	2	5	10	12	22
(5) other	1	3	4	1	0	1	2	5	7	4	0	4	8	8	16
(6) no response	3	2	5	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	6	3	9
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:
S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE #5

RESPONSES TO: "ONE THING I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS _____"

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
(1) sleep/go to bed	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	5
(2) drink liquor/liquor	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	3	3	1	2	3	1	10	11
(3) physically agress	3	2	5	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	4	4	8
(4) run away/regress or repress	6	2	8	1	0	1	3	8	11	5	0	5	15	10	25
(5) take dope/drugs/pot	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	1	4
(6) live/ emotionally let loose	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
(7) interact with Big Leg Emma	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3
(8) other	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	1	1	1	0	1	3	3	6
(9) no response	0	1	1	1	1	2	2	0	2	0	1	1	3	3	6
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE #6

RESPONSES TO: "BUT, I WANT _____"

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
(1) sleep	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
(2) drink	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	4	4	2	2	4	2	10	12
(3) physically agress	1	2	3	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5
(4) run away/regress or repress	3	1	4	1	1	2	0	4	4	2	0	2	6	6	12
(5) take drugs/dope/pot	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	1	5
(6) live/live it up	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	4
(7) interact with Big Leg Emma	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	5
(8) desire for improving onself and/or others	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	3	3	6
(9) other	2	2	4	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	0	2	5	5	10
(10) no response	2	1	3	1	1	2	2	0	2	1	1	2	6	3	9
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE #7

RESPONSES TO: "I THINK I'LL GET SOME _____"

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
(1) liquor/whiskey/booze	5	5	10	3	2	5	2	10	12	4	5	9	14	22	36
(2) dope	2	3	5	0	2	2	2	1	3	1	0	1	5	6	11
(3) loving/physical/action/ life (living it up)	2	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	7
(4) other	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	2	3	0	3	3	5	8
(5) no response	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	1	7
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE #8

SEX X PREJUDICE RATINGS

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
MALF	5	4	9	3	4	7	3	6	9	5	4	9	16	18	34
FEMALE	6	6	12	2	3	5	3	8	11	5	2	7	16	19	35
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE # 9

YEAR IN SCHOOL X PREJUDICE RATINGS

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
Freshman - Sophomore	1	5	6	1	2	3	2	4	6	2	2	4	6	13	19
Junior - Senior	10	5	15	4	5	9	4	10	14	8	4	12	26	24	50
TOTAL	11	10	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	69

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

TABLE #10

SCHOLASTIC ACHIEVEMENT X PREJUDICE RATINGS

	UNRATED			LEAST PREJUDICED			MIDDLE PREJUDICED			MOST PREJUDICED			TOTAL		
	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.	S.	N.	T.
Excellent/Good (4.0 - 3.0)	3	4	7	1	6	7	3	7	10	1	5	6	8	22	30
Average (2.5 - 2.0)	5	4	9	2	1	3	2	6	8	7	0	7	15	12	27
Poor (under 2.0)	4	1	5	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	9	3	12
TOTAL	12	9	21	5	7	12	6	14	20	10	6	16	32	37	29

KEY:

S. = South

N. = North

T. = Total

Footnotes

[1] Capell, Arthur; Studies in Socio-Linguistics, p. 98.

[2] Mowlana, Hamid and Holz, Robert; "Racial Recognizability of Verbal Communication and School Integration: A Study in Differential Perception", p. 2.

[3] Getze, George, "English of Some Blacks Differs, Gets Defended", p. 16-c.

[4] Mowlana, Hamid and Holz, Robert, op. cit., p. 9.

[5] From the album "From New Orleans to Chicago", on the London label. the song is entitled, "(Going Down to) Big Leg Emma's".

[6] The prerequisite of a Thurstone scale is that the intervals between the statements be approximately equal. This property of the scale is achieved through the method in which it is constructed. In the article "A Social Distance Scale" (1933) (3), Bogardus revises his original scale. He had subjects rate each of 60 statements according to the amount of social distance each statement was judged to represent. After averaging the scores of each statement, he wrote "In order to obtain a series of equal social-distance situations, the statements having means nearest 2.00, 3.00, 4.00, 5.00, and 6.00 were selected, which together with the statements (1 and 53) having means of 1.00 and 6.98, constitute the series of seven nearly equi-distant social distance situations that were selected for the scale." (p. 269).

[7] "Scholastic Achievement" ratings for each respondent are based upon the final grade received by the student in the course, used in the study, for that quarter.

[8] Martin, James G. and Westie, Frank R., "The Tolerant Personality", American Sociological Review, p. 528.

[9] Allport, Gordon W., The Nature of Prejudice, p. 372-373.

Bibliography

1. Allport, Gordon W., The Nature of Prejudice, Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1958.

2. Anisfeld, Moshe, Norman Bogo, and Wallace E. Lambert, "Evaluational Reactions to Accented English Speech", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 65, no. 4, 1962, pp. 223-231

3. Bogardus, Emory S., "A Social Distance Scale", Sociology and Social Research, vol. 17, no. 3, 1933.

4. Campbell, Donald T., "The Bogardus Social Distance Scale", Sociology and Social Research, vol. 36, no. 5, 1952.

5. Capell, Arthur, Studies in Socio-Linguistics, Mouton & Company, London, 1966.

6. Coleman, James C., Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life, Scott, Foresman and Company, Chicago, 1964, pp. 545-548.

7. Getze, George, "English of Some Blacks Differ, Gets Defended", The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Sunday, November 22, 1970, p. 16-c.

8. Lambert, Wallace E., Hannah Frankel, and G. Richard Tucker, "Judging Personality Through Speech: A French-Canadian Example", Journal of Communication, 4, 1966, pp. 305-321.

9. Lambert, W.E., R.C. Hodgson, R.C. Gardner, and S. Fillenbaum, "Evaluational Reactions to Spoken Languages", Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, vol. 60, no. 1, 1960, pp. 44-51.

10. Markel, Norman, Richard M. Eisler, and Hayne W. Reese, "Judging Personality from Dialect", Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 6, 1967, pp. 33-35.

11. Martin, James G. and Frank R. Westie, "The Tolerant Personality", American Sociological Review, vol. 24, no. 4, August 1959, pp. 521-528.

12. Miller, Delbert, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, David McKay Company, Inc., New York, 1964, pp. 222-230.

Bibliography, continued.

13. Mowlana, Hamid and Robert Holz, "Racial Recognizability of Verbal Communication and School Integration: A Study of Differential Perception". Paper read before the Theory and Methodology Division of the Association for Education in Journalism, Washington, D.C., August, 16-20, 1970.

14. Tucker, Richard G. and Wallace E. Lambert, "White and Negro Listeners' Reactions to Various American-English Dialects", Social Forces, 47:4, pp. 463-8.

15. Williams, Frederick, Reasoning With Statistics, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., New York, 1968.

Appendix

Name _____

(1) Remember to give your first feeling reactions in every case.

(2) Give your reactions to each group as a whole. Do not give your reactions to the best or to the worst members that you have known, but think of the picture that you have of the whole group.

(3) Put an "x" within each column for each group in as many of the seven rows as your feelings dictate.

	English	Mexicans	Swedes	Negroes	French	American Indians	Irish
1. To close kinship by marriage							
2. To my club as personal friends							
3. To my street as neighbors							
4. To employment in my occupation							
5. To citizenship in my country							
6. As visitors only to my country							
7. Would exclude from my country							

LYRICS TO "(GOING DOWN) TO BIG LEG EMMA'S"

MUSICAL INTRODUCTION

SPEAKER #1: (Sigh) Man, this road sure is dusty...We just keep on going...That little house setting over there...You don't have to worry about a thing...When we get there...Everything is allright, man...We just keep on going...You know one thing, I believe we'll go over to Big Leg Emma's house...What time is it, man?

SPEAKER #2: It ain't that late.

SPEAKER #1: You know one thing, you got the.....

SPEAKER #2: Oh, I always had it.

SPEAKER #1: Man, did you see.....

SPEAKER #2: Don't worry about that, man.

SPEAKER #1: One thing I would like to.....

SPEAKER #2: No, don't do that.

SPEAKER #1: But, I.....

SPEAKER #2: I tried that.

SPEAKER #1: We almost there...We just keep rolling...Ha, Ha...Umph, Umph, Umph.....Always on this road, Always on this road...Ya have to stay on this road when ya ain't got no car or nothing like that.....I think I'll get the.....

SPEAKER #2: Oh, that's too strong, man...We have such a good understanding.

SPEAKER #1; You know one thing, man...We sure is...I'm telling you, or you telling me...Somebody telling somebody...You

know what I think...I think we just's well detour cross here and go on over to Big Leg Emma's house.

MUSICAL INTERLUDE

SPEAKER #1: Umph, umph, umph.

Name _____ _____

Fill in the missing part of the question with the most likely word or words. Base your response upon the information presented within the song.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
(1) What time is it, man? (What time do you think it is? _____)	---It's not that late.
(2) Do you know one thing, you got the _____	---I always had it.
(3) Man, did you see _____	---Don't worry about it.
(4) One thing I would like to do is _____	---No man, don't do that.
(5) But, I want _____	---I tried that.
(6) I think I'll get some _____	---That's too strong, man.

Sentences and Phrases Written by the Northern Students Relating to the Experiment and Their Perception of the Experience:

Discussion of Technique

"...we could not tell just what the men were talking about, as their conversation was taken 'out of context' for us. They were communicating with one another within their own frame of reference. However, this frame of reference was not revealed to us. This made the tape ambiguous and a great variety of responses would result from the great uncertainties present."

"...each person had a limited idea of what was going on. The questionnaire revealed what each individual felt had happened and illustrated how vastly each person can vary in response to a message that leaves so much unspoken, and has no pattern to it."

"Uncertainty affected my exposure to the audio message greatly. There was so little information given to us by their dialogue that I was uncertain about their situation. I had no idea about the time or what they wanted."

"The audio message has only two things going for it. One is the pattern of the conversation and the other is the nature of the voices speaking, the latter being more significant since it transfers to the listeners information about the types of characters speaking."

Insight into Their Own Cognitive Processes

"The audio message left me very confused. Had I known more about the characters involved I could have responded with more certainty. As it was, I relied on stereotypes and my own values."

"...I inferred that the man was going to do something wrong. The tone of his voice, and previous conversation led me to this assumption."

"In class we were given the recording....which had a number of essential words and phrases left out and to the imagination. Since everyone had their own unique and different set of experiences to draw from, it was only natural that there would be a variation in meanings. We were not sure whether our meaning was similar to the meaning that the recording had intended."

"...we filled in words, we had no idea what was 'really' happening. Each of us had to dig into our own backgrounds to fill in the words."

"Each individual's prejudices and backgrounds (patterns formed on previous experiences) would tend to classify the speakers in different situations."

Results of Their Racial Identification

"I used the word 'soul' and in my mind, it still does not fit the sentence."

"The characters we heard used crude language."

"...the fact that the men sounded black (prejudice could have entered - black = (bad))"

"In the experiment...an audio tape was played in which one could hear two black men talking."

"The tone of how they said things and the fact that the two men were black would have some effect on how one would answer the questions."